



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,861	02/22/2002	Robert Otillar	06730.0016.CPUS00	2418

7590 03/11/2005

ROBERT P. OTILLAR  
950 N. SAN ANTONIO RD  
SUITE 16D  
LOS ALTOS, CA 94022

EXAMINER
----------

LUDLOW, JAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1743

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/683,861

Applicant(s)

OTILLAR ET AL.

Examiner

Jan M. Ludlow

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-78 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-38, 42-45, 59-73, 76 and 78 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39-41, 46-58, 74, 75 and 77 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1743

1. Newly submitted claims 59-73, 76, 78 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: The invention originally claimed and the newly submitted claims are related as combination and subcombination. The combination does not require the details of the subcombination, such as providing a substantially uniform magnetic field to alter the magnitude of the transduced force. The subcombination has separate utility, such as localizing particles without detecting their number.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 59-73, 76, 78 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

2. Claims 39-58, 74-75, 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

With respect to claim 39, there is no teaching that the number of attracted particles is "discrete and predetermined." Note that the word "discrete" does not appear anywhere in the application as filed and there is therefore no indication of what "discrete" is intended to mean within the context of this application, and if the number were predetermined (also not disclosed as filed), why would you have to measure it?

Art Unit: 1743

With respect to claims 48 and 57, "low power consumption" is not disclosed as filed. The remainder of the claim finds support in [0145]. While a permanent magnet as disclosed may indeed require "low power," the scope of "low power consumption" is broader than a permanent magnet and not mentioned.

In claim 50, there is no support for using pH, optical, radiation, temperature or pressure sensors to detect the number of particles. These sensors are used to detect properties of, e.g., substances bound to the beads. If applicant intends these as an additional detecting step, this should be more clearly claimed.

In claim 51, "under...", "above...", "between...", "operably connected..." and "combinations thereof" are not supported by the application as filed. "Adjacent..." finds support in claim 40 as filed ("proximal") and "surrounding..." finds support in Fig. 3.

In claim 53, "predetermined number" lacks support in the application as filed.

In claim 54, "regulating the number...by repelling" lacks support in the application as filed.

In claim 55, "predetermined number" lacks support in the application as filed. See, e.g., [0051].

In claim 58, a uniform magnetic field generated by a "battery-powered device" is not found in the application as filed.

Claim 75 is not supported as filed in that there no discussion of "a substantial distance" relative to "radius".

3. The amendment filed December 13, 2004 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no

Art Unit: 1743

amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as explained above.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

4. The examiner suggests that applicant review the specification as filed prior to filing a response, and pointing out where support is found for each amendment. The examiner notes claim 52 finds support at [0148].

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 1743

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 39-41, 46-58, 74-75, 77, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhou in view of Burden.

9. Zhou teaches a spatially addressable magnetic bead array method (abstract and elsewhere).

10. Zhou fails to teach detection of the number of magnetic particles at each site.

Burdon teaches a method of moving fluid through a microfluidic device including a cavity 204 surrounded by coil 202 for detecting inductance of magnetic particles entering the cavity (col. 19, line 46 – col. 20, line 30, esp. line 26, Figure 4). Individually actuated electromagnets may be used to pump fluid (col. 26, line 50-col. 28, line 50).

11. It would have been obvious to detect the number of particles at each site in the device of Zhou in order to monitor fluid flow in a microfluidic device as taught by Burden.

1. Applicant's arguments filed December 13, 2004 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 1743

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jan M. Ludlow whose telephone number is (571) 272-1260. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 11:30 am - 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jan M. Ludlow  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1743

Jml

March 6, 2005